G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1895-6.

~~191~~ .

(Land Revenue)

P-28

File No. 266 of 95-96.

Serial Nos. 1 — 9.

Papers Filed.

Month November '96.

Counter marked

H813

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the Mysore District Dy: Commr's order suspending the Shanbhogue of Kura.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Indexed: Srinivasa Rao

Sub Stock

112

The Sub Dn. Officer wishes, before restoring the suspended Shanbogue Hanumanthappa, to have a Municipal Collection establishment on Rs 30 per mensem as follows:-

1 Mutsaddy on 12 Rs
1 Asst Mutsaddy on 6 Rs
2 peons @ 5 Rs each for 12 Rs
+ contingencies
30 Rs.

The arrears still remaining to be collected are roughly kept at Rs 13,213-3-3 after deducting more than 5000 Rs already collected. This establishment, being only 6 per cent of the net normal income, may be sanctioned.

26/10/96

Lucy in 1st qr

This large Esta may not be absolutely necessary after the accounts are written up, & the arrears recovered. A smaller Esta may perhaps be sufficient for the collection of the normal dealer-tax. The Esta established for now may be sanctioned for a year subject to the report at the end of that period as to the

approved
QM
27/10/96

Vide my minute on a previous page of the order passed on the Rev Council. The funds

Note the Eg. assessors
Q
27-10-96

correspondence may be sent
to Tamella for perusal
27/10/96

I am glad the
establishment
asked for has
been sanctioned
in the Ind Dept.
The order passed
about the Shoulder
was with the con-
-currence of the
Ind Dept & requires
no re-consideration
Even in this reply
the Subadar officer
states that the
whole work is
beyond the capacity
of one man & a single Sharp's charge
The local offrs are
certainly blame
blamed for the
unsatisfactory state
of the Ind accounts
& balance & outlay
but I am not
called upon to say
anything.)

Hamoomantaggah
will be reinstated
at once subject to
further demur
& it is to be hoped
that there will be
no further representation
in this matter. 3.11.96

Incl. in d/ for
Mirzal Q
27-10-96

Ans from Camp
27.12.96

(60)

No reference coming on the 1892 ...

1895

Section L R

FILE No. 26 No. 1836 / 1896

SERIAL No. 1 Name of Petitioner, Shanbogue Hanumaiah

Village, Kura

Taluk, Seringapatam

District, Mysore.

Date of Arzi, 17-11-95

Date of Receipt,

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 3.

General Accts

Please put up the Dro. asked for

MK
4/12
The Govt. Pass referred to is of 1892/3. Records in the Govt Record is only upto 30 June 92 and no fasli date.
4/12/95

4/12
5/12 Requested in the Rte to bring the L.R. Branch. This may be done through

5/12
To L R Branch
Please put up

5/12 In this no. contains the Dro. was sent to your branch on 13/8/95 & not returned back
5/12

The file quoted above relates to the Village Collections of the Shanbogue Inam Village & seems to correspond with the Petition of the Petr. Please put up L.R. 133-92

5/12 Copy of the Dro is put up

MK 6/12
This copy is not in the form, hence the Petr. is requested to file a printed copy of the order concerning village offices so that facts may be found in the Village file & L.R.
Note the terms of 1873 & Govt of 1892 & Village Inam regd by Bailiffs.
1. Records please put up the Inam Inspector
2/ MK

7/12 [illegible]

Abstract.

Appealing against the Inam District Deputy Commissioner's order suspending the Petitioner.

The order is as follows:—

You are the Seringapatam Shanbogue. You say that you would do the duties of the village Shanbogue alone but not that of the town Shanbogue. There is no separate Shanbogue for the town. If you are unwilling to do the town duties, you should forego the village duties also. It will not do to have a separate Shanbogue for the town alone. The Sub-Division Officer seems to have

a man's full attention without affording him time to look after other duties.

Adds that the difficulty of managing both the duties would be evident from the fact that about Rs 13,000 were left in arrears when the Municipal duty was conducted by a separate establishment

Prays that on these grounds the Dy Comr's order may be reversed and his hereditary Patelki gen restored to him.

Rlbn.

2/12

have suspended you for your having persisted in refusing to do the town duties. Since a fresh pay is allowed for the town duty, you should carry on the work taking some of your own men to help you. We cannot allow you to choose the best portion of a duty & reject the others. Therefore abide by the Sub-Division Officer's order soon."

Petitioner states that when the Seringapatam and Ganjam Municipalities were formed in 1890-1 he was appointed to work after the Munsiff in the work in addition to his revenue duty; that 2 years thereafter, upon the Petr's complaint to Govt of the impossibility of carrying on both the works, the Munsiff duties were removed from the Petr as per Mysore Dist Dr Supt's Order No 181, dt 23-1-93 and an Overseer was appointed to carry on the work with the assistance of 2 Jamadars & 2 peons; that subsequently the Petr was asked in Sub's No 335/12 dt 4-1-93, based upon Govt Pros No 5805, dt 28-10-92, to take charge of the Munsiff duty as a village servant; that again upon his complaint to Govt of the difficulty of carrying on both the works a separate establishment was made to carry on Munsiff work and the Petr gave the charge to the persons appointed; that, that in spite of these former proceedings the Dy Comr has passed the order against which the Petr appeals.

The grounds for this appeal are as follows:—

(1) That the Dy Comr's confirmation of the Sub Dr's order suspending the Petr, against former proceedings, from his hereditary Shanbogi is illegal.

(2) That in many other Districts ~~[illegible]~~ Headquarters Taluks Municipalities which are smaller than Seringapatam separate Jamadars are appointed for the municipality and the Seringapatam Municipality is larger than that of any other Municipality in Mysore excepting those of Mysore & Bangalore.

(3) That the revenue Shanbogi being a large one it would engage

a

PETITION DEPARTMENT
PRESENTED 18 92
PRESIDENCY DEWAN'S OFFICE

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

ONE RUPEE COURT FEE STAMP

ONE RUPEE COURT FEE STAMP

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 1856

23-9-96

1856

Have one rupee stamps affixed

6

62

1895

SECTION 1 R

No. 2113.

FILE No. 266 R.

SERIAL No.

Name of Petitioner, Kammantaya

Village, Sankaguddahalli

Taluk, Seringapatam

District, Mysore

Date of Arzi, 14-12-95

Date of Receipt, 16-12-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

Call for immediate report of the case stating from whom he ascertained whether in the Shankaguddahalli charge the Sowcars included if not the 3rd Sri should state his reasons for forming a Shankaguddahalli do duties which are not comprised

ABSTRACT.

Reminder to his petition of 8-11-95 appealing against the Dy Comr's order directing him to look after the Sunki work in addition to his duty.

In this charge the petitioner should state whether in Seringapatam there is another Shankaguddahalli & what Sowcar he gets

Ulsto
19/12/95

Bln
16/12

Dy Comr
19-12-95

RR 20/12

DD
21-12-95

7.

2113

MYSORE DEWANS SECRETARIAT
PETITION DIARY
REG'D. N. 2113 R
DATE 16-12-95

73

Hanumantaiya

This Shanbogue was ordered
It seems by the Revenue
present himself before him
in Mysore. He has come here
His petition of 18-11-95 referre
from the above has not been
received here -

May the office be asked
to send the Petn and the Petr
~~called~~ informed that his Papers
are called for.

Submitted for order.

14/12/95

8 Pa

Draft

20-8-95

25/12

SECTION R

Pet No. 5

FILE No. 2417/95

SERIAL No. 3

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2413 dated 20th August 1895 received at the Dewan's Office from Hanumantaiya Shanbhogue of Kura & Ali Ranga-batam taluk, appealing against the orders of the Deputy Commissioner directing him to resign the municipal work in addition to his duties and requesting him from the office of Shanbhogue if unable to do the work

is forwarded, together with ~~his~~ the enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Mysore Dist. for early report especially ~~the grounds to be ascertained is~~ whether the Shanbhogue's charge ~~the grounds~~ included ~~& if not~~ ~~the Deputy Com should state his~~ reasons for forcing a Shanbhogue to do duties which not comprised in his charge. The should also state whether for balamtron there is another Shanbhogue and what steps he

By Order,

Draft

BANGALORE,

21-12-1895

25

Chief Secretary.

M.G.C.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000

9

No. 738
Enclosures No. Five.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Camp Heggadadevankote ~~189~~ .
27th December 1895.

(18) (95)

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
of the Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Revenue Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Government of Mysore.

SIR.

With reference to your official memorandum No. Jet. 1203 of the 24th December 1895 forwarding for report the petitions of Hanumantiah, Shanbhog of Seringapatam, I beg to state as follows:-

2. The complaint of the petitioner is that he is required to do the duties of Shanbhog not only of the village of Seringapatam, but also of the town of Seringapatam.

3. There is only one Shanbhog for both the village of Seringapatam and the town of Seringapatam. In fact they are both one village. When the part of it called the town of Seringapatam was made into a municipality, it became necessary to keep separate accounts for the mohatarfa

revenue collected in it. That work being more tedious than that connected with the village, the Shanbhog preferred to keep the latter and complained of the heaviness of the former. Thereupon a separate paid agency was employed for the former, but experience of its working showed that it was not advisable to substitute an irresponsible paid agency for an hereditary arrangement having the advantage of permanent interest and continuous responsibility. Therefore the Sub Division Officer of French Rocks called upon the Shanbhog to do his duties himself employing under him upon his own responsibility a Gumasta if he liked out of the allowance payable to him for the collection of the mohaturfa revenue of the town, but he declined to have anything to do with the work of the town and preferred to keep only the better part of his duties. Thereupon the Sub-Division Officer suspended him and on appeal I saw no reason to alter his order. These are

the

1203 9

SECTION L-R.

FILE No. 241 R 95-6

SERIAL No. 4

1895 REVENUE DEPARTMENT C.L. No. 1203 No. 437 5 JAN 1896 DEWAN'S OFFICE

Submitted 8/1/96 HHR

The Deputy Commissioner, of the Mysore District.

To Revenue Government
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Sated Respondent
9
9-1-96

Dated 27th December 1895.
Despatched
Received

(73)

Enclosures No. Hide

No. 738

Reporting on the petitions of Hanumantiah, Siddhaiya & Seringapatam.

Refer
4/3/96 Cys

The Dwn consultant does not clearly state whether the Town Jud revenue is included in the Sorgi calculation of this Shanbogue. If so the grant of an additional money remuneration is unintelligible. If not included it is the right thing to call upon the Shanbogue to do duties which at the time of the Sorgi settlement he was not expected to. This point must be clearly explained. Information is also wanted as to how the Sorgi due to the Shanbogue will be affected if the Town revenue

Reference also taken in calculation the municipal remuneration which he has hitherto enjoyed
12-1-96
11.1.96

12.

(76)

SECTION L-R.Q.
FILE No. 266 of 1896
SERIAL No. 5

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

(15)

Read:—

Letter No 738 dated 27th December 1895 from the Deputy-Commissioner of Mysore, reporting on the petition of Hanumaiah Shanbhog of Seringapatam regarding his suspension from the office.

—u—

Order thereon. 6460. P.1311 8/18.1.96

The Deputy-Commissioner's report does not clearly state whether the Town Municipal revenue is included in the Poligi calculation of this Shanbhog. If so, the grant of an additional money

13

remuneration is unintelligible. If not included, it is not right to call upon the Shanbhog to do duties which at the time of the Potaji Settlement he was not expected to do. This point must be clearly explained.

(16)

The Dy Cr is also requested to report ~~Information is also wanted~~ ~~as to~~ how the Potaji due to the Shanbhog would be affected if the Town Revenue is also taken into calculation, and what is the Municipal remuneration now offered to him.

Draft for approval

HCb 18/1/96

Draft C. Revenue Secretary

To The Deputy Commr Mysore District.

SC 18/1

1896. 15

GOVERNMENT { Rec'd 10 Mar. 79

(19)

From
The Sub Division Officer
French Rocks

To
The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated 10th
Dispd
Recd } March 1896.

General No 980.

Sir,

Adverting to your Memo No 289 dated the 28th January 1896, giving cover to copy of Government Proceedings on the petition of Hanumantha Shanboque of Seringapatam, I have the honor to report as follows.

2. The town municipal revenue was not included in calculating the Polige due to this Shanboque.

3. Separate establishment was entertained for the municipal collection work. This the Government considered unnecessary

and

the facts of the case.

4. The petitions under report with their enclosures are herein enclosed.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obdt. servant.

C. Kerkatovamoyan

Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

14

L. R.

C 4972½

SECTION Gen. 31

24 MAR 96

DEWAN'S OFFICE

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE

7801

Submitted with reference to the 2nd Commissioner's letter No. 7308 of 22/3/96

A.J.
24/3/96

24/3/96

I do not think the Shanbogue can be fairly called upon to do the collection work of the municipality. It had long ago been separated from the village & the Shanbog's remuneration was calculated on the basis of the revenue of the village alone. His usual work for the municipality is not unreasonable as the revenue of the municipality & the village is above 12000 Rs and is certainly above the limit of a single Shanbogue's charge. The Petn. must therefore be reinstated & action taken to appoint another Shanbogue for the municipality.

Report with the Govt. order upon this issued under

9/4/96

The Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Revenue and General Depts.

Dated 16th March 1896.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1167
No.

Enclosure No. etc

79

Submitting copy of the French Rocks Sub-Division Officer's letter giving all particulars required, regarding the municipal revenue of Seringapatam when settling the fotigi of the Shanbhog of that place.

R. P. Rama
21/3/96

21/3

Submitted.
24/3

and directed that it should be done by village officials on a remuneration of 2 per cent on collection vide Proceedings No. $\frac{5954-15}{27157-92}$ of 31st October 1892. The Shanbogue was accordingly called upon to perform the duties. Hence the recommendation for money remuneration.

4. The town municipal revenue is about Rs. 6000 and that of the village Rs. 560. If the Police be calculated on these amounts separately the Shanbogue will be entitled to Rs. 120 and Rs. 125 respectively; but if they are added, he will be entitled to Rs. 185 only. The latter course if adopted, will affect the Police by Rs. 60.

5. The remuneration offered calculating

No. 1167
Gen-1

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Mysore District
Dated Mysore, 18th March 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir,

With reference to Government order No. 6460 dated the 18th January 1896, and your reminder No. P. 1311 / 1718 dated the 14th March 1896, enquiring if the municipal revenue of Seringapatam was taken into account when settling the potagi of the Shanabhog thereof, I beg to submit herewith copy of the French Rocks Sub-Division Officer's letter No. 900 dated the 10th instant, giving all the particulars required.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obdt. servant,

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

Compd: MM
Gen.

calculating at 2 per cent on the total collection is Rs 198.

I have &c
"signed" P. Panchanatha Row
Sub Divn Officer
Yercaud Rocks.

"Copy"
Venkataraman
Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District

Confidential

18

SECTION L. R.

FILE No. 206 / 1956

SERIAL No. 7

(109)

Letter from the OC Mysore No. 1167 of 18.3.96 submitting a copy of the French Rocks Sub Div Officer's letter giving all particulars regarding the municipal revenue of Seringapatam when serving the post of the Shanbogue of that place.

Letter No. 7387/ on 27.12.95 from the same officer reporting on the petition of Sh. Hanumanta of Kura Seringapatam requesting his appointment for refusing to collect the municipal collections

Order thereon

Decd 6-2-97
C
7-9-96

No. 3095 / R. 1095 — 8.21.96

L 7 157-92

Good observe that the Hanumanta of Kura Shanbogue cannot be fairly called upon to do the collection work of the municipality of Seringapatam. It had long been separated from the villages of Kura and the Shanbogue's remuneration was calculated on the basis of the revenue of this village alone. His refusal for the work to municipality is not unreasonable

as the revenue of both the Municipality of Seringapatam and the Village of Kiriya is about Rs 12000 and is certainly above the limit of a Sub Shanbhog's Charge. The Petitioner Hanumantappa will therefore be reinstated, and action taken to appoint another Shanbhog for the Municipality

20.9.96

Secretary
7/9/96

D.C. Mysore

[This is prepared in accordance with the orders of the Commr recorded on Mysore D.C. etc 11/7 of 18/3/96]
7/9/96

This is [illegible]

4/9

26

4733

114

SECTION L-R

FILE No. 24/1895-6

SERIAL No. 8

189

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF MYSORE
3371
14. OCT 1896

From

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Mysore District.

L. 755

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Dated 7th October 1896.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. one

No. 707

Submitting copy of a letter from the Sub-Ma. officer of French Rocks re collection of Mahalurja tax of the Seringapatam town. —

SMB 10/10/96

RS 19/10

Submitted to Col. for orders

[illegible]

No 707 Ex-1

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District
Dated Mysore 7th October 1896

To,

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue and General Department

Sir,

With reference to Government order No $\frac{3095}{R1095}$ of the 21st September 1896 stating that the Shanbhog of the Seringapatna village is not bound to collect the Mohatarfa tax of that town even on payment therefor, and directing that the order suspending him for refusal to do that work should be cancelled and he be reinstated, I beg to submit herewith for orders a copy of the French Rocks Sub Division officer's letter No 422 of the 5th October 1896. It will be seen from it that the Sub Division officer thinks that, if the order passed were given effect to at once, it will upset the arrangement made by him for the collection of the heavy arrears of the Mohatarfa tax of the town of Seringapatam. I do not think that his apprehensions are unfounded. It was ruled in Government order No $\frac{5954-63}{dJ.157-92}$

N° 422 Sub. Division Office French Rocks
Encl to 8/M Dated 5th October 1896.

(27)

From

P. Panchanatha Row. Esquire
Sub. Division Officer
French Rocks.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Of the Mysore District

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Memo N° 117 dated 22d September 1896 on copy of Government Proceedings N° 3095/R. 1096 of 21st idem, re the restoration of Hammanthia to his post of Shambogue of the Kura Village in the Seringapatam Talug, and in reply beg to report as follows.

2. The Municipality was introduced into the towns of Seringapatam and Gangam in 1870-71, and the Moohatharffa taxes thereof were being collected by a special Establishment till the end of June 1892.

3. In January 1893 the above Establishment was abolished under the orders of Government

Government as conveyed in their Proceedings

(28)

No 5954-63 / L.F. 157-92 dated 31st October 1892, and the Mohatharffa collections were entrusted to the Village Establishment with a promise of giving them 2 per cent of commission on the collections.

4. The Village Establishment declined to do the work in spite of warnings, and the arrears having swelled, a representation was made to Government to the entertainment of 2 Mutsaddies at Rs 10 each for six months. The temporary Establishment was sanctioned in February 1894, Vide Government Proceedings No 14215-6 / I.F. 42-93 dated 23d February 1894. It did little or no work. The arrears swelled enormously high and the time up to which the temporary establishment was to be kept on having expired, the Shanbogue and Patail were called upon to do the work, employing on their own responsibility, a Gumastah, if they liked, out of the allowance payable to them for the collection of Mohatarffa revenue. The Shanbogue at first consented to this arrangement and asked for an advance to begin with the work. It was granted. He changed his mind afterwards and refused to have anything to do with the Mohatarffa work, although it formed part of his legitimate duty, Vide para 14 of

of the 31st October 1892 that it was the Shanbhogs' work to collect the Mohatarfa taxes and yet he neglected it. If, however, the Government are now pleased to relieve him of that duty, I beg that sanction may be kindly accorded to the entertainment of the additional establishment, proposed by the Sub Division Officer, in para 11 of his letter, for the collection of the Mohatarfa tax. In my humble opinion even this will not be a satisfactory arrangement. It was tried and given up. In almost all the Municipal towns the Shanbhogs do the Mohatarfa work also, and the employment of this permanent hereditary agency for the work of collection is, to my humble thinking, far preferable to paid establishment. If only the Government be pleased to order that the Shanbhog of Seringapatam should, as elsewhere, do the Mohatarfa work also, as directed in the said order of 1892, all obstinacy will disappear and work glide on easily.—

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt servant
[illegible]
Dy Commissioner of Mysore

of the Government Proceedings quoted in para 3 supra.

5. The Shanbogue's conduct in retracting his statement was blameworthy, and he was accordingly suspended from rank and pay, and a substitute was appointed for both the town and village. I would also invite your kind attention to the circumstances reported in this office letter No 299 of 10th September 1895 and also to your reply No 124 dated 13th September 1895 thereto.—

6.— The Mohatarffa accounts are in a state of utter confusion. They have to be prepared from the year Pramady (1879–80). The acting incumbent who is an intelligent and experienced Accountant has prepared the accounts of about 15 years, and there are only a few years' accounts to be made up, when only, the individual balance can be ascertained. The collection work also has progressed fairly, so much as Rs 5083-7-6 having been recovered. The cost of paper used for Kathis and Khirdies, and other accounts would come to more than Rs 50.

7. To disturb the present arrangement therefore, at this stage without making adequate provision for Mohatarffa collection, means allowing things to fall back into confusion.

8 The Revenue, however, of both the Municipality of Seringapatam and the village of Nura is above the limit of a single Shanbogue's charge.

9. I beg to submit that before I can reinstate Hanumanthia, it is my wish that a provision be made for the performance of the Mohatarffa

Mohatarffa work.

10 The arrears up to the end of September 1896 amount to Rs 13,213-3-3. as shewn in the subjoined statement, inclusive of the current year's Jamabandy which has yet to be ascertained. The Amildar says that he cannot vouch for the correctness of the figure until the accounts that are in the course of preparation are finally closed. But it is certain that the figure will be more but not less.

Pramady	1879-80	Rs 1-14-0
Vikrama	1880-81	" 29-8-0
Vishue	1881-82	" 17-2-5
Chithrabhanu	1882-83	" 15-8-0
Swabhanu	1883-84	" 20-8-0
Tarana	1884-85	" 14-"-"
Parthiva	1885-86	" 32-"-"
Vyaya	1886-87	" 39-"-"
Sarvajithu	1887-88	" 78-11-"
Sarvathari	1888-89	" 224-10-"
Virody	1889-90	" 334-2-"
Vikruthi	1890-91	" 380-1-4
Idhara	1891-92	" 557-6-8
Nandana	1892-93	" 884-2-11
Vijia	1893-94	" 2379-2-11
Jaya	1894-95	" 2937-6-8
Manmatha	1895-96	" 5367-15-4
	Total	Rs 13,213-3-3

11. Under these circumstances, I would solicit that an establishment of Rs 30/- a month as noted in the margin* may kindly be sanctioned for the Mohattraff work. This expenditure will be only 6 per cent of the net income after the standing arrears are cleared.

One (1) Mandadoy	@ Rs 12 per mensem	Rs 144 per annum
One (1) Hasli Mandadoy	@ do	72 do
Two peons	@ Rs 5/- each	120 do
Contingencies	@ 2 do	24 do
Total	Rs 30 do	Rs 360 do

12. For the reasons explained in paras 6 and 7 supra, I have not yet issued an order reinstating Hanumanthia as directed, but will do so on receipt of a reply which I beg you will be good enough to favour me with, at your earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
Sd/ P. Panchanada Row
Sub Divisional Officer
French Rocks.

Copy
[illegible]
Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

27

Read P.

FILE No. 3 Pol 6

SERIAL No. 1896

Letter No. 7 Cot. 1896 from the Commr. Mysore, submitting with reference to G.O. No. 3095/P.1095 21st Septr. 1896, a copy of French Police Sub Divisional Officer's Letter No. 1225 of 5 Oct. 1896 and requesting sanction for the entertainment of the marginally noted additional establishment for the collection of arrears of the Municipality of Seringapatam.

1 Mistendoly on Rs 12	24
1 Peon on 6	72
2 Peons at Rs 5 each	20
Contingencies	24
	360

Order thereon

The establishment applied for is sanctioned tentatively for a year, subject to the submission of a report at the end of that period as to the

R.L. 854.

5463-4 / 157-92 9/12/11/96

the State of Orissa. The
Fy Comr is requested to point out the
source in the current year's Budget from which the change can be met

(2) Shambhag Magistrates
should be reinstated at once
and without further demur. It
is to be hoped that there will
be no further representation in
this matter

Secretary
Sd/- 7/11/96

To Fnce Comr, Orissa
The Comptroller

10-11-96